

Remarks/Arguments

In order to more clearly define the invention, Claims 1, 2, 4 and 9 have been amended.

Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections under 35 USC 112.

This invention relates to a multiple output conversion unit with a filter means coupled between the inputs/outputs to allow a communication channel between different inputs/outputs while preventing passage of signals in an intermediate frequency band.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over WO 02/065780 to Antoine et al, in view of EP 1024613 to Watanaba et al and US 5,276,904 to Mutzig et al. The Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, affects the patentability of the instant Claims as amended.

The Examiner has admitted that Antoine et al does not show a filter which links inputs/outputs in a communication band. The Examiner looks to Watanaba et al for this feature. Watanaba et al shows, in Figures 1 and 2, a low pass filter (8, 9, 80, 81) in series with each signal output. However, nowhere does Watanaba et al show or suggest:

“filter means linking the inputs/outputs of the selecting part to allow control signals in a communication signal frequency band to pass between the inputs/outputs while preventing passage of signals therebetween in the intermediate frequency band”,

as specifically recited in Claims 1 as amended, or:

“filter means linking the inputs/outputs to allow control signals in a communication frequency band to pass therebetween while preventing passage of signals in the intermediate frequency bands”,

as specifically recited in Claim 9 as amended. Rather, Watanaba et al shows a low pass filter in series with each output, with no filter means linking the inputs/outputs for passage of control signals and prevention of passage of signals in intermediate bands. It is therefore clear that neither Antoine et al nor Watanaba et al affect the patentability of Claims 1 and 9 as amended.

Similarly, nowhere does cited US 5,276,904 to Mutzig et al show or suggest:

“filter means linking the inputs/outputs of the selecting part to allow control signals in a communication signal frequency band to pass between the inputs/outputs while preventing passage of signals therebetween in the intermediate frequency band”,

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended, nor does Mutzig et al show or suggest:

“filter means linking the inputs/outputs to allow control signals in a communication frequency band to pass therebetween while preventing passage of signals in the intermediate frequency bands”,

as specifically recited in Claim 9 as amended. It is therefore clear that even if Mutzig et al were to be combined with Antoine et al and Watanaba et al the patentability of Claims 1 and 9 would not be affected.

Claims 2 and 4 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Cited US 6,088,569 to Bach et al has only been applied to Subclaims 2 and 4. However, the Applicant will discuss this reference with regard to their parent Claim 1. Nowhere does Bach show or suggest:

“ filter means linking the inputs/outputs of the selecting part to allow control signals in a communication signal frequency band to pass between the inputs/outputs while preventing passage of signals therebetween in the intermediate frequency band”,

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. It is therefore clear that Bach et al does not affect the patentability of parent Claim 1, much less that of dependent Claims 2 and 4.

The Applicant therefore submits that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Raoul Monnier

by _/Daniel E. Sragow/_____
Daniel E. Sragow, Attorney
Reg. No. 22,856
(609) 734-6832

Patent Operation
THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Dated: __12 January 2010_____